

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT CHARLESTON

ANTHONY GEORGE COOK,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:04-0727

MARTY C. ANDERSON,
WARDEN, F.C.I. BECKLEY,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

By Standing Order entered on May 20, 2002, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary E. Stanley. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the Standing Order directs Magistrate Judge Stanley to submit proposed findings and recommendation concerning the disposition of this matter. Magistrate Judge Stanley submitted her Proposed Findings and Recommendation on August 19, 2005, and proposed that this court (1) confirm and accept the Magistrate Judge's findings contained within his Proposed Findings and Recommendation, (2) dismiss petitioner's Application under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Docket No. 64), and (3) direct the Clerk to remove this matter from the court's docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted ten days, plus three mailing days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge VanDervort's Proposed Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file

objections within the appropriate time frame constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court.

Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Moreover, this court need not conduct a de novo review when a petitioner "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). No objections were filed in this case.

Having reviewed the Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Stanley, the court (1) CONFIRMS and ACCEPTS the factual and legal analysis within the magistrate judge's Proposed Findings and Recommendation, and (2) DISMISSES petitioner's § 2241 Application (Docket No. 64).

The Clerk is directed to remove this action from the active docket of this court. The Clerk is further directed to forward a certified copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to all counsel of record and the plaintiff, pro se.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 15th day of September, 2005.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "David A. Faber", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Faber
Chief Judge